arXiv:1611.03532v1 [math.AP] 10 Nov 2016

On the strict monotonicity of the first eigenvalue of the p-Laplacian on annuli

T. V. Anoop, Vladimir Bobkov*†, Sarath Sasi

Abstract. Let B_1 be a ball in $\mathbb{R}^N$ centred at the origin and B_0 be a smaller ball compactly contained in B_1. For $p \in (1,\infty)$, using the shape derivative method, we show that the first eigenvalue of the p-Laplacian in annulus $B_1 \setminus \overline{B_0}$ strictly decreases as the inner ball moves towards the boundary of the outer ball. The analogous results for the limit cases as $p \to 1$ and $p \to \infty$ are also discussed. Using our main result, further we prove the nonradiality of the eigenfunctions associated with the points on the first nontrivial curve of the Fučik spectrum of the p-Laplacian on bounded radial domains.
Mathematics Subject Classification (2010): 35J92, 35P30, 35B06, 49R05.
Keywords: p-Laplacian, symmetries, shape derivative, Fučik spectrum, eigenvalue, eigenfunction, nonradiality.

1 Introduction

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be a bounded domain with $N \geq 2$. We consider the following nonlinear eigenvalue problem:

$$\left.\begin{aligned} -\Delta_p u = \lambda |u|^{p-2}u \quad & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 \quad & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{aligned}\right\} \tag{1.1}$$

where $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and Δ_p is the p-Laplace operator given by $\Delta_p u := \operatorname{div}(|\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u)$, $p > 1$. A real number λ is called an eigenvalue of (1.1) if there exists u in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}$ satisfying

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^{p-2} \, \langle \nabla u, \nabla v \rangle \, \mathrm{d}x = \lambda \int_\Omega |u|^{p-2} \, u \, v \, \mathrm{d}x, \quad \forall \, v \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega),$$

and u is said to be an eigenfunction associated with λ.

It is well known that (1.1) admits a least positive eigenvalue $\lambda_1(\Omega)$ which has the following variational characterization:

$$\lambda_1(\Omega) = \inf \left\{ \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^p \, \mathrm{d}x : u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \setminus \{0\} \text{ with } \|u\|_p = 1 \right\}.$$

In this article we consider Ω of the form $B_{R_1}(x) \setminus \overline{B_{R_0}(y)}$ with $\overline{B_{R_0}(y)} \subset B_{R_1}(x)$, where $B_r(z)$ denotes the open ball of radius $r > 0$ centred at $z \in \mathbb{R}^N$. Since the p-Laplacian is invariant under orthogonal transformations, it can be easily seen that

$$\lambda_1(B_{R_1}(x) \setminus \overline{B_{R_0}(y)}) = \lambda_1(B_{R_1}(0) \setminus \overline{B_{R_0}(se_1)})$$

*The author was supported by the project LO1506 of the Czech Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports.
†corresponding author

for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^N$ such that $|x-y| = s$, where e_1 is the first coordinate vector. Let the annular region $B_{R_1}(0) \setminus \overline{B_{R_0}(se_1)}$ be denoted by Ω_s and let

$$\lambda_1(s) := \lambda_1(\Omega_s).$$

We are interested in the behaviour of $\lambda_1(s)$ with respect to s (in other words, with respect to the distance between centres of the inner and outer balls). The main objective of this article is to show that $\lambda_1(s)$ is strictly decreasing on $[0, R_1 - R_0)$ for any $p > 1$.

Apparently the first result in this direction was obtained by Hersch in [16], where he proved (in the case $N = 2$, $p = 2$ and even for more general annular domains) that $\lambda_1(s)$ attains its maximum at $s = 0$. In [23], Ramm and Shivakumar conjectured[1] that $\lambda_1(s)$ is strictly decreasing and they gave numerical results to support this claim. Later this conjecture and its higher dimensional analogue were proved independently by Harrel et al. [14] and Kesavan [19]. Their proofs mainly rely on the following expression for $\lambda_1'(s)$ obtained using the Hadamard perturbation formula (see [12, 24]):

$$\lambda_1'(s) = -\int\limits_{x \in \partial B_{R_0}(se_1)} \left| \frac{\partial u_s}{\partial n}(x) \right|^2 n_1(x)\, \mathrm{dS}(x), \tag{1.2}$$

where u_s is the positive eigenfunction associated with $\lambda_1(s)$ with the normalization $\|u_s\|_2 = 1$, and n_1 is the first component of $n = (n_1, \ldots, n_N)$, the outward unit normal to Ω_s. In [14, 19], the authors used the above formula in conjunction with reflection techniques and the strong comparison principle to show that $\lambda_1'(s)$ is negative on $(0, R_1 - R_0)$. For further reading and related open problems on this topic, we refer the reader to the books [2, 15].

For general $p > 1$, it is natural to anticipate that $\lambda_1(s)$ is strictly decreasing on $[0, R_1 - R_0)$. Indeed, we have the following generalization of formula (1.2):

$$\lambda_1'(s) = -(p-1) \int\limits_{x \in \partial B_{R_0}(se_1)} \left| \frac{\partial u_s}{\partial n}(x) \right|^p n_1(x)\, \mathrm{dS}(x). \tag{1.3}$$

The above expression was derived in [8] using the Hadamard perturbation formula (shape derivative formula) for $\lambda_1'(s)$ obtained in [13]. However for $p \neq 2$, one lacks a strong comparison principle that guarantee the strict monotonicity of $\lambda_1(s)$. More precisely, the strong comparison principle that is applicable for the nonlinear nonhomogeneous problems of the following type:

$$-\Delta_p u = \lambda |u|^{p-2} u \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad u = g \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega. \tag{1.4}$$

Thus one can not directly extend the ideas of [23, 14, 19] to the nonlinear case and establish the strict monotonicity of $\lambda_1(s)$ for general $p > 1$. Nevertheless, in [8], Chorwadwala and Mahadevan could show that $\lambda_1'(s) \leq 0$ for all $s \in [0, R_1 - R_0)$ using a *weak* comparison principle proved in [9] for problems of the form (1.4). However, the authors of [8] could not rule out even the possibility of $\lambda_1(s)$ being a constant, due to the absence of the *strong* comparison principle. In this article, we bypass the usage of the strong comparison principle and prove the following result.

[1] Later a proof for this conjecture using an argument attributed to M. Ashbaugh was published in arxiv:math-ph/9911040 by the same authors.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $p \in (1,\infty)$ and let $\lambda_1(s)$ be the first eigenvalue of $-\Delta_p$ on Ω_s. Then*

$$\lambda_1'(0) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_1'(s) < 0, \ \forall\, s \in (0, R_1 - R_0).$$

In particular, $\lambda(s)$ is strictly decreasing on $[0, R_1 - R_0)$.

For our proof, we derive another formula for $\lambda_1'(s)$ (in terms of the normal derivative of u_s on the outer boundary) in the following form:

$$\lambda_1'(s) = (p-1) \int\limits_{x \in \partial B_{R_1}(0)} \left| \frac{\partial u_s}{\partial n}(x) \right|^p n_1(x)\, \mathrm{dS}(x). \tag{1.5}$$

We obtained the above expression by considering the perturbations of Ω_s generated by shifts of the outer ball. On the other hand, formula (1.3) was obtained in [8] by considering the perturbations generated by shifts of the inner ball. If we assume $\lambda_1'(s) = 0$ for some $s \in (0, R_1 - R_0)$, then formulas (1.3) and (1.5) help us to show that the first eigenfunction u_s associated with $\lambda_1(s)$ is radial (up to a translation) in some annular neighbourhoods of the inner and outer boundaries of Ω_s. This eventually leads to a contradiction.

Next we study the monotonicity property of the corresponding limit problems. To avoid the ambiguity, for each $p > 1$, here we denote the first eigenvalue $\lambda_1(s)$ by $\lambda_1(p, s)$. It is known that $\lim\limits_{p\to\infty} \lambda_1^{1/p}(p,s)$ and $\lim\limits_{p\to 1} \lambda_1(p,s)$ exist, see [17, 18]. We denote the limit functions as below:

$$\Lambda_\infty(s) := \lim_{p\to\infty} \lambda_1^{1/p}(p,s) \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda_1(s) := \lim_{p\to 1} \lambda_1(p,s).$$

Now we state results analogous to Theorem 1.1.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $\Lambda_\infty(s)$ and $\Lambda_1(s)$ be defined as before. Then $\Lambda_\infty(s)$ and $\Lambda_1(s)$ are continuous on $[0, R_1 - R_0)$ and*

(i) *$\Lambda_\infty(s)$ is strictly decreasing on $[0, R_1 - R_0)$;*

(ii) *$\Lambda_1(s)$ is decreasing on $[0, R_1 - R_0)$. Moreover, there exists $s^* \in [0, R_1 - R_0)$ such that $\Lambda_1(0) = \Lambda_1(s^*) > \Lambda_1(s)$ for all $s \in (s^*, R_1 - R_0)$.*

We use a geometric characterization of $\Lambda_\infty(s)$ given in [17] for proving part (i), and for the existence of s^* in part (ii) we use a variational characterization of $\Lambda_1(s)$ given in [18].

Finally, we study the following Fučik eigenvalue problem:

$$\left.\begin{aligned} -\Delta_p u = \alpha(u^+)^{p-1} - \beta(u^-)^{p-1} \quad &\text{in } \ \Omega, \\ u = 0 \quad &\text{on } \ \partial\Omega, \end{aligned}\right\} \tag{1.6}$$

where α, β are real numbers (spectral parameters) and $u^\pm := \max\{\pm u, 0\}$. If problem (1.6) possesses a nontrivial solution for some (α, β), then we say that (α, β) belongs to the Fučik spectrum of (1.6).

In [10], the authors considered a set of critical values $c(t)$ given by

$$c(t) := \inf_{\gamma\in\Gamma} \max_{u\in\gamma[-1,1]} \left(\int\limits_\Omega |\nabla u|^p \, \mathrm{d}x - t \int\limits_\Omega (u^+)^p \, \mathrm{d}x \right), \tag{1.7}$$

where

$$\Gamma := \{\gamma \in \mathcal{C}([-1,1],\mathcal{S}) :\ \gamma(-1) = -\varphi_1,\ \gamma(1) = \varphi_1\}, \tag{1.8}$$
$$\mathcal{S} := \{u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) :\ \|u\|_p = 1\},$$

and φ_1 is the first eigenfunction of (1.1) with the normalization $\|\varphi_1\|_p = 1$. Note that $c(0) = \lambda_2(\Omega)$, the second eigenvalue of (1.1). Using $c(t)$, the authors gave a description of the *first nontrivial* curve $\mathscr{C}$ of the Fučik spectrum of (1.6) as the union of the points $(t + c(t), c(t))$, $t \geq 0$, and their reflections with respect to the diagonal (t, t). Further, they shown that $\mathscr{C}$ is continuous and each eigenfunction associated with a point on $\mathscr{C}$ has exactly two nodal domains (see Theorem 2.1 of [11]).

In [5], Bartsch et al. conjectured that in the linear case ($p = 2$) any eigenfunction corresponding to a point on $\mathscr{C}$ is nonradial in a bounded radial domain (i.e., Ω is a ball or annulus). In the same article, they showed that the conjecture holds in a neighbourhood of $(\lambda_2(\Omega), \lambda_2(\Omega))$ (see Remark 5.2 of [5]). A complete proof of this conjecture was given by Bartsch and Degiovanni in [4] by estimating generalized Morse indices of corresponding eigenfunctions. In [6], Benedikt et al. gave a different proof for this conjecture for a ball in $\mathbb{R}^N$ with $N = 2$ and $N = 3$. In this article, we provide another proof for this conjecture for any bounded radial domain and even extend this results for general $p \in (1, \infty)$.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $p \in (1, \infty)$ and Ω be a bounded radial domain in $\mathbb{R}^N$, $N \geq 2$. Then any eigenfunction associated with a point on the first nontrivial curve $\mathscr{C}$ of the Fučik spectrum of the problem (1.6) is nonradial.*

We obtain the above result as a simple consequence of Theorem 1.1. Moreover, Theorem 1.3 gives a generalization and a simpler proof for Theorem 1.1 of [1] which states the nonradiality of second eigenfunctions of the p-Laplacian on a ball.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we first introduce the reflections with respect to the hyperplanes and the affine hyperplanes. Then we briefly describe the shape derivative formula of [13] and derive the formulas (1.3) and (1.5) for $\lambda_1'(s)$. Finally we state some results which will be required in the later parts of this article.

For a nonzero vector $a \in \mathbb{R}^N$, let H_a be the hyperplane perpendicular to a, i.e.,

$$H_a = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N :\ \langle a, x\rangle = 0\}.$$

Further, we define the half-spaces

$$\mathcal{H}_a^+ := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N :\ \langle a, x\rangle > 0\}, \quad \mathcal{H}_a^- := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N :\ \langle a, x\rangle < 0\}.$$

Let σ_a be the reflection with respect to the hyperplane H_a, i.e.,

$$\sigma_a(x) = x - 2\frac{\langle a, x\rangle}{|a|^2}a = x\left[I - 2\frac{a^T a}{|a|^2}\right],\ \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \tag{2.1}$$

where the last expression is the matrix product of the vector x and the matrix $\sigma_a = I - 2\frac{a^T a}{|a|^2}$. Let $\widetilde{\sigma}_a$ be the reflection about the affine hyperplane $se_1 + H_a$. Then $\widetilde{\sigma}_a$ is given as below:

$$\widetilde{\sigma}_a(x) = x - 2\frac{\langle a, x - se_1\rangle}{|a|^2}a = \sigma_a(x) + 2\frac{\langle a, se_1\rangle}{|a|^2}a.$$

Now we recall the set $\Omega_s = B_{R_1}(0) \setminus \overline{B_{R_0}(se_1)}$ and for each nonzero vector a in $\mathbb{R}^N$, consider the following subsets of Ω_s:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}_a^+ &:= \Omega_s \cap \mathcal{H}_a^+; \quad \widetilde{\mathcal{O}}_a^+ := \Omega_s \cap \left(\mathcal{H}_a^+ + se_1\right); \\ \mathcal{O}_a^- &:= \Omega_s \cap \mathcal{H}_a^-; \quad \widetilde{\mathcal{O}}_a^- := \Omega_s \cap \left(\mathcal{H}_a^- + se_1\right). \end{aligned}$$

The relation between some of the subsets of $\overline{\Omega}_s$ under the reflections are listed below:

$$\left.\begin{aligned} \sigma_a(\mathcal{O}_a^+) = \mathcal{O}_a^-; \quad & \widetilde{\sigma}_a(\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}_a^+) = \widetilde{\mathcal{O}}_a^-, \ \forall\, a \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\} \text{ with } \langle a, e_1\rangle = 0; \\ \sigma_a(\mathcal{O}_a^+) \subset \mathcal{O}_a^-; \quad & \widetilde{\sigma}_a(\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}_a^+) \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{O}}_a^-, \ \forall\, a \in \mathbb{R}^N \text{ with } \langle a, e_1\rangle > 0; \\ \sigma_a(\partial B_{R_0}(se_1) \cap \partial \mathcal{O}_a^+) \subset \mathcal{O}_a^-; \quad & \widetilde{\sigma}_a(\partial B_{R_1}(0) \cap \partial \widetilde{\mathcal{O}}_a^+) \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{O}}_a^-, \ \forall\, a \in \mathbb{R}^N \text{ with } \langle a, e_1\rangle > 0; \\ \sigma_a(\partial B_{R_1}(0) \cap \partial \mathcal{O}_a^+) = \partial B_{R_1}(0) \cap \partial \mathcal{O}_a^-, \ & \forall\, a \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\}; \\ \widetilde{\sigma}_a(\partial B_{R_0}(se_1) \cap \partial \widetilde{\mathcal{O}}_a^+) = \partial B_{R_0}(se_1) \cap \partial \widetilde{\mathcal{O}}_a^-, & \forall\, a \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\}. \end{aligned}\right\} \tag{2.2}$$

Now for a function u defined on $\overline{\Omega}_s$ and for a vector $a \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\}$ with $\langle a, e_1\rangle \geq 0$ we define two new functions $u_a : \overline{\mathcal{O}_a^+} \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\widetilde{u}_a : \overline{\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}_a^+} \to \mathbb{R}$ as below:

$$u_a(x) := u(\sigma_a(x)); \quad \widetilde{u}_a(x) := u(\widetilde{\sigma}_a(x)).$$

By recalling the notation $\sigma_a = I - 2\frac{a^T a}{|a|^2}$ from (2.1), for $u \in \mathcal{C}^1(\overline{\Omega_s})$ we see that

$$\nabla u_a(x) = \nabla u(\sigma_a(x))\sigma_a, \ \forall x \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_a^+}; \quad \nabla \widetilde{u}_a(x) = \nabla u(\widetilde{\sigma}_a(x))\sigma_a, \ \forall x \in \overline{\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}_a^+}. \tag{2.3}$$

Further, the normal vector satisfies the following relations:

$$n(\sigma_a(x)) = n(x)\sigma_a, \, \forall\, x \in \partial B_{R_1}(0) \cap \mathcal{O}_a^+; \quad n(\widetilde{\sigma}_a(x)) = n(x)\sigma_a, \, \forall\, x \in \partial B_{R_0}(se_1) \cap \mathcal{O}_a^+. \tag{2.4}$$

Shape derivative formulas

For a smooth bounded vector field V on $\mathbb{R}^N$ consider the perturbation of Ω_s given as $\widetilde{\Omega}_t = (I + tV)\Omega_s$. It is known by Theorem 3 of [13] that $\lambda_1(t, V) := \lambda_1(\widetilde{\Omega}_t)$ is differentiable at $t = 0$ and the derivative is given by

$$\lambda_1'(0, V) := \lim_{t \to 0} \frac{\lambda_1(t, V) - \lambda_1(0, V)}{t} = -(p-1) \int\limits_{\partial \Omega_s} \left| \frac{\partial u_s}{\partial n}(x) \right|^p \langle V(x), n(x)\rangle \, \mathrm{dS}, \tag{2.5}$$

where n is the outward unit normal to $\partial\Omega_s$ and u_s is the first eigenfunction corresponding to $\lambda_1(s)$ normalized as

$$u_s > 0 \text{ and } \|u_s\|_p = 1. \tag{2.6}$$

In [8], the authors considered the vector field V as given below:

$$V(x) = \rho(x)e_1, \ \rho \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(B_{R_1}(0)) \text{ and } \rho(x) \equiv 1 \text{ in a neighbourhood of } B_{R_0}(se_1). \tag{2.7}$$

For this choice of V and for t sufficiently small, the perturbations $\widetilde{\Omega}_t$ of Ω_s are generated by the shifts of the inner ball. More precisely,

$$\widetilde{\Omega}_t = \Omega_{s+t}.$$

Therefore, one gets $\lambda_1(t,V)=\lambda_1(s+t), \lambda_1(0,V)=\lambda_1(s)$ and hence (2.5) yields

$$\lambda_1'(s)=-(p-1)\int\limits_{\partial B_{R_0}(se_1)}\left|\frac{\partial u_s}{\partial n}(x)\right|^p n_1(x)\,\mathrm{dS}, \tag{2.8}$$

where n_1 is the first component of n, the outward unit normal to $\partial\Omega_s$ on $\partial B_{R_0}(se_1)$ (i.e., the inward unit normal to $\partial B_{R_0}(se_1)$).

To derive the expression (1.5) for $\lambda'(s)$ (i.e., formula involving the normal derivative of u_s on the outer boundary), we consider the perturbations of Ω_s generated by the shifts of the outer boundary. Indeed, such perturbations can be obtained by taking a vector field $V(x)=-\rho(x)e_1$ with $\rho\in\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and

(i) $\rho=0$ in a neighbourhood of the inner sphere $\partial B_{R_0}(se_1)$;

(ii) $\rho=1$ in a neighbourhood of the outer sphere $\partial B_{R_1}(0)$.

For this choice of V, for t sufficiently close to 0, observe that

$$\widetilde{\Omega}_t=B_{R_1}(-te_1)\setminus\overline{B_{R_0}(se_1)}.$$

From the translation invariance of the p-Laplacian, we get

$$\lambda_1(t,V)=\lambda_1\left(B_{R_1}(0)\setminus\overline{B_{R_0}((s+t)e_1)}\right)=\lambda_1(s+t).$$

Now (2.5) yields

$$\lambda_1'(s)=\lim_{t\to0}\frac{\lambda_1(s+t)-\lambda_1(t)}{t}=(p-1)\int\limits_{\partial B_{R_1}(0)}\left|\frac{\partial u_s}{\partial n}(x)\right|^p n_1(x)\,\mathrm{dS}, \tag{2.9}$$

where n_1 is the first component of n, the outward unit normal to $\partial\Omega_s$ on $\partial B_{R_1}(0)$ (i.e., the outward unit normal to $\partial B_{R_1}(0)$).

Next we rewrite the integral in (2.9) using certain symmetries of the domain Ω_s. Set $u=u_s$ in (2.9) and express the integral as a sum of two integrals:

$$\int\limits_{\partial B_{R_1}(0)}\left|\frac{\partial u}{\partial n}(x)\right|^p n_1(x)\,\mathrm{dS}=\int\limits_{\partial B_{R_1}(0)\cap\partial\mathcal{O}_{e_1}^+}\left|\frac{\partial u}{\partial n}(x)\right|^p n_1(x)\,\mathrm{dS}+\int\limits_{\partial B_{R_1}(0)\cap\partial\mathcal{O}_{e_1}^-}\left|\frac{\partial u}{\partial n}(x)\right|^p n_1(x)\,\mathrm{dS}. \tag{2.10}$$

From (2.3) and (2.4) we have $\frac{\partial u}{\partial n}(x')=\frac{\partial u_{e_1}}{\partial n}(x)$ and $n_1(x')=-n_1(x)$ on $\partial B_{R_1}(0)\cap\mathcal{O}_{e_1}^+$, where $x'=\sigma_{e_1}(x)$. Hence, we modify the second integral as below:

$$\begin{aligned}\int\limits_{\partial B_{R_1}(0)\cap\partial\mathcal{O}_{e_1}^-}\left|\frac{\partial u}{\partial n}(x)\right|^p n_1(x)\,\mathrm{dS}&=\int\limits_{\partial B_{R_1}(0)\cap\partial\mathcal{O}_{e_1}^+}\left|\frac{\partial u}{\partial n}(x')\right|^p n_1(x')\,\mathrm{dS}\\&=-\int\limits_{\partial B_{R_1}(0)\cap\partial\mathcal{O}_{e_1}^+}\left|\frac{\partial u_{e_1}}{\partial n}(x)\right|^p n_1(x)\,\mathrm{dS}.\end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

Thus, by combining (2.9), (2.10) and (2.11) we get

$$\lambda_1'(s)=(p-1)\int\limits_{\partial B_{R_1}(0)\cap\partial\mathcal{O}_{e_1}^+}\left(\left|\frac{\partial u}{\partial n}\right|^p-\left|\frac{\partial u_{e_1}}{\partial n}\right|^p\right)n_1\,\mathrm{dS}. \tag{2.12}$$

Similarly we can rewrite formula (2.8) as below:

$$\lambda_1'(s) = -(p-1) \int\limits_{\partial B_{R_0}(se_1)\cap\partial\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}_{e_1}^+} \left(\left|\frac{\partial u}{\partial n}\right|^p - \left|\frac{\partial \widetilde{u}_{e_1}}{\partial n}\right|^p \right) n_1 \, \mathrm{dS}. \tag{2.13}$$

Auxiliary results

Next we state a few results that we require in the subsequent sections. First we recall some results about the regularity of eigenfunctions of (1.1) (cf. Theorem 1.3 of [3]).

Proposition 2.1. *Let Ω be a smooth domain in $\mathbb{R}^N$ and let u be a first eigenfunction of (1.1). Then the following assertions are satisfied.*

(i) $u \in \mathcal{C}^1(\overline{\Omega})$.

(ii) $u \in \mathcal{C}^2(\overline{\Omega_\delta})$, *where* $\Omega_\delta := \{x \in \Omega : \operatorname{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) < \delta\}$ *and* $|\nabla u| > m > 0$ *in* Ω_δ *for some* m.

The following version of the strong maximum principle is due to Vazquez (Section 4, [25]).

Proposition 2.2. *Let Ω be a domain in $\mathbb{R}^N$. Let $w \in \mathcal{C}^1(\overline{\Omega})$ be a positive function satisfying*

$$-\operatorname{div}\left(a_{ij}(x)\frac{\partial w}{\partial x_j}\right) \geq 0 \text{ in } \Omega,$$

where $a_{ij} \in W^{1,\infty}_{loc}(\Omega)$ and there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that $a_{ij}(x)\xi_i\xi_j \geq \alpha|\xi|^2$, $\forall\, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\}$, $\forall\, x \in \Omega$. Then

(i) $w \equiv 0$ *in* Ω *or else* $w > 0$ *in* Ω.

(ii) *Let x_0 be a point on $\partial\Omega$ satisfying the interior sphere condition. If $w > 0$ in Ω and $w(x_0) = 0$, then*

$$\frac{\partial w}{\partial n}(x_0) < 0,$$

where n is the outward unit normal to $\partial\Omega$ at x_0.

In the next proposition we state a weak comparison result, see Theorem 2.1 and Proposition 4.1 of [9].

Proposition 2.3. *Let Ω be a domain in $\mathbb{R}^N$ with Lipschitz boundary. Let $u_1, u_2 \in \mathcal{C}^1(\overline{\Omega})$ be positive weak solutions of $-\Delta_p u = \lambda u^{p-1}$ in Ω. If $u_1 \geq u_2$ on $\partial\Omega$, then*

$$u_1 \geq u_2 \text{ in } \Omega \text{ and } \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial n} \leq \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial n} \text{ on } \{x \in \partial\Omega : u_1(x) = u_2(x) = 0\}.$$

3 Main result

In this section we give the proof of Theorem 1.1. We will be considering various annular regions apart from Ω_s, for simplicity we denote them as

$$A_{r_1,r_0}(x, y) = B_{r_1}(x) \setminus \overline{B_{r_0}(y)}.$$

In particular, $A_{R_1,R_0}(0, se_1) = \Omega_s$. Throughout this section, unless otherwise specified, the eigenfunction u_s is the first eigenfunction of $-\Delta_p$ on Ω_s normalized as in (2.6), namely $u_s > 0$ and $\|u_s\|_p = 1$.

The following result is proved in [8] (see Theorem 3.1) using formula (2.13). Here, for the sake of completeness, we present a proof by making use of formula (2.12).

Lemma 3.1. *Let $s \in [0, R_1 - R_0)$ and let $\lambda_1(s)$ be the first eigenvalue of $-\Delta_p$ on Ω_s. Then $\lambda'(s) \leq 0$.*

Proof. By setting $u = u_s$ and noting that $\sigma_{e_1}(\mathcal{O}_{e_1}^+) \subset \mathcal{O}_{e_1}^-$ and $\sigma_{e_1}(\partial B_{R_0}(se_1) \cap \partial\mathcal{O}_{e_1}^+) \subset \mathcal{O}_{e_1}^-$, we easily see that u_{e_1} and u weakly satisfy the following problems:

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta_p u_{e_1} &= \lambda_1(s)\, u_{e_1}^{p-1}, & -\Delta_p u &= \lambda_1(s)\, u^{p-1} && \text{in } \mathcal{O}_{e_1}^+, \\ u_{e_1} &= 0, & u &= 0 && \text{on } \partial B_{R_1}(0) \cap \partial\mathcal{O}_{e_1}^+, \\ u_{e_1} &= u, & u &= u_{e_1} && \text{on } H_{e_1} \cap \partial\mathcal{O}_{e_1}^+, \\ u_{e_1} &> 0, & u &= 0 && \text{on } \partial B_{R_0}(se_1) \cap \partial\mathcal{O}_{e_1}^+. \end{aligned}$$

Thus by applying the weak comparison principle (Proposition 2.3) we obtain $u_{e_1} \geq u$ in $\mathcal{O}_{e_1}^+$. Moreover, as $u = 0$ on $\partial B_{R_1}(0) \cap \partial\mathcal{O}_{e_1}^+$, Proposition 2.2 yields

$$\frac{\partial u_{e_1}}{\partial n} \leq \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} < 0 \text{ on } \partial B_{R_1}(0) \cap \partial\mathcal{O}_{e_1}^+. \tag{3.1}$$

Now since $n_1(x)$ is positive for $x \in \partial B_{R_1}(0) \cap \partial\mathcal{O}_{e_1}^+$, from (2.12) and (3.1) we derive that

$$\lambda_1'(s) = (p-1) \int\limits_{\partial B_{R_1}(0) \cap \partial\mathcal{O}_{e_1}^+} \left(\left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} \right|^p - \left| \frac{\partial u_{e_1}}{\partial n} \right|^p \right) n_1 \, \mathrm{dS} \ \leq 0.$$

This completes the proof. □

Symmetries with respect to the hyperplanes

First we study symmetries of the first eigenfunction of $-\Delta_p$ on Ω_s. We show that for $s \in (0, R_1 - R_0)$ the associated first eigenfunction is symmetric with respect to the hyperplanes perpendicular to H_{e_1}.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $s \in (0, R_1 - R_0)$ and let u_s be the first eigenfunction of $-\Delta_p$ on Ω_s. If $a \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\}$ with $\langle a, e_1 \rangle = 0$, then*

$$u_s(x) = u_s(\sigma_a(x)),\ \forall x \in \Omega_s.$$

In particular, for $i = 2, 3, \ldots, N$

$$u_s(x) = u_s(\sigma_{e_i}(x)) = u_s(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{i-1}, -x_i, x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_N),\ \forall x \in \Omega_s.$$

Proof. Clearly for $a \neq 0$ with $\langle a, e_1 \rangle = 0$, $\mathcal{O}_a^+ = \sigma_a(\mathcal{O}_a^-)$ (see (2.2)). Thus $u := u_s$ and $u_a := u_s \circ \sigma_a$ weakly satisfy the following problems, respectively:

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta_p u_a &= \lambda_1(s)\, u_a^{p-1}, & -\Delta_p u &= \lambda_1(s)\, u^{p-1} && \text{in } \mathcal{O}_a^+, \\ u_a &= u, & u &= u_a && \text{on } \partial\mathcal{O}_a^+. \end{aligned}$$

Now by the weak comparison principle (Proposition 2.3), we obtain that $u_a \equiv u$ in $\mathcal{O}_a^+$, which implies the desired assertions. □

In the next lemma we show that u_s is symmetric also with respect to H_{e_1} in a neighbourhood of the outer boundary, provided $\lambda_1'(s) = 0$.

Lemma 3.3. *If $\lambda_1'(s) = 0$ for some $s \in (0, R_1 - R_0)$, then there exists $r_1 > 0$ such that*

$$u_s(x) = u_s(\sigma_{e_1}(x)),\ \forall x \in A_{R_1,r_1}(0,0).$$

Proof. We set $u = u_s$. Since $u \in \mathcal{C}^1(\overline{\Omega_s})$, $u > 0$ and u vanishes on $\partial B_{R_1}(0)$ and $\partial B_{R_0}(se_1)$, there exists $r^* \in (R_0 + s, R_1)$ such that $\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_1}(r^* e_1) = 0$. Define

$$r_1 = \sup\left\{|x| > 0 :\ \langle \nabla u(x), x\rangle = 0\right\}. \tag{3.2}$$

As $\frac{\partial u}{\partial n}(x) < 0$ on $\partial B_{R_1}(0)$ (by Proposition 2.2), $\langle \nabla u(x), x\rangle < 0$ in a neighbourhood of $\partial B_{R_1}(0)$. Thus clearly $r_1 \in [r^*, R_1)$. By the construction, $A_{R_1,r_1}(0,0)$ is the maximal annular neighbourhood of $\partial B_{R_1}(0)$ on which $\langle \nabla u(x), x\rangle$ is nonvanishing. Further, by the continuity of ∇u there must exist $x_1 \in \partial B_{r_1}(0)$ such that

$$\langle \nabla u(x_1), x_1\rangle = 0. \tag{3.3}$$

Set $u_{e_1} = u \circ \sigma_{e_1}$ on $A_{R_1,r_1}(0,0) \cap \mathcal{O}^+_{e_1}$. To show $u \equiv u_{e_1}$ we linearise the p-Laplacian on the domain $A_{R_1,r}(0,0) \cap \mathcal{O}^+_{e_1}$ with $r_1 < r < R_1$ by setting $w = u_{e_1} - u$. Then w weakly satisfies the following problem:

$$\begin{aligned} -\mathrm{div}(A(x)\nabla w) = \lambda\left(u_{e_1}^{p-1} - u^{p-1}\right) \geq 0 \quad & \text{in } A_{R_1,r}(0,0) \cap \mathcal{O}^+_{e_1}, \\ w \geq 0 \quad & \text{on } \partial(A_{R_1,r}(0,0) \cap \mathcal{O}^+_{e_1}), \end{aligned}$$

where the coefficient matrix $A(x) = [a_{ij}(x)]$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} a_{ij}(x) = \int_0^1 & |(1-t)\nabla u(x) + t\nabla u_{e_1}(x)|^{p-2} \\ & \times \left[I + (p-2)\frac{\left[(1-t)\nabla u(x) + t\nabla u_{e_1}(x)\right]^T\left[(1-t)\nabla u(x) + t\nabla u_{e_1}(x)\right]}{|(1-t)\nabla u(x) + t\nabla u_{e_1}(x)|^2} \right]_{ij} \mathrm{d}t. \end{aligned}$$

Now we show that $A(x)$ is uniformly positive definite on $A_{R_1,r}(0,0) \cap \mathcal{O}^+_{e_1}$. Since $\langle \nabla u(x), x\rangle$ does not vanish on $A_{R_1,r_1}(0,0)$ and is negative near the boundary $\partial B_{R_1}(0)$, we see that $\langle \nabla u(x), x\rangle < 0$ in $A_{R_1,r}(0,0)$. By the continuity, we can find $\delta_r > 0$ such that

$$\langle \nabla u(x), x\rangle < -\delta_r \text{ in } A_{R_1,r}(0,0).$$

Notice that $\langle \nabla u_{e_1}(x), x\rangle = \langle \nabla(u(\sigma_{e_1}(x))), x\rangle = \langle \nabla u(\sigma_{e_1}(x))\sigma_{e_1}, x\rangle = \langle \nabla u(\sigma_{e_1}(x)), \sigma_{e_1}(x)\rangle$. Thus, by the above inequality we have $\langle \nabla u_{e_1}(x), x\rangle < -\delta_r$ in $A_{R_1,r}(0,0) \cap \mathcal{O}^+_{e_1}$. Therefore,

$$(1-t)\langle \nabla u(x), x\rangle + t\langle \nabla u_{e_1}(x), x\rangle < -\delta_r, \forall t \in [0,1], \forall x \in A_{R_1,r}(0,0) \cap \mathcal{O}^+_{e_1}.$$

Hence, for $x \in A_{R_1,r}(0,0)$ we get

$$|(1-t)\nabla u(x) + t\nabla u_{e_1}(x)| \geq \left|\left\langle (1-t)\nabla u(x) + t\nabla u_{e_1}(x), \frac{x}{|x|}\right\rangle\right| > \frac{\delta_r}{R_1} = m_r. \tag{3.4}$$

Further, since $|\nabla u|$ is bounded in $A_{R_1,r}(0,0)$, there exists $M_r > 0$ such that

$$|(1-t)\nabla u(x) + t\nabla u_{e_1}(x)| \leq M_r. \tag{3.5}$$

Note that for each $a \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\}$, the matrix $a^T a$ has eigenvalues $\{0, |a|^2\}$. Thus, for any $y \in \mathbb{R}^N$,

$$\min\{1, p-1\}|a|^{p-2}|y|^2 \le \left\langle |a|^{p-2}\left[I + (p-2)\frac{a^T a}{|a|^2}\right] y, y \right\rangle \le \max\{1, p-1\}|a|^{p-2}|y|^2. \quad (3.6)$$

From (3.4), (3.5) and (3.6), for $x \in A_{R_1,r}(0,0)$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^N$ we obtain

$$\langle A(x)y, y\rangle \ge \begin{cases} m_r^{p-2}|y|^2 & \text{for } p \ge 2, \\ (p-1)M_r^{p-2}|y|^2 & \text{for } 1 < p < 2. \end{cases}$$

Thus the differential operator in (3.4) defined by means of $A(x)$ is uniformly elliptic in $A_{R_1,r}(0,0)$. Moreover, by Proposition 2.1, $a_{ij} \in \mathcal{C}^1(A_{R_1,r}(0,0))$. Hence, the strong maximum principle for (3.4) (Proposition 2.2) implies that either $w \equiv 0$, or $w > 0$ in $A_{R_1,r}(0,0) \cap \mathcal{O}_{e_1}^+$. Moreover, if $w > 0$ in $A_{R_1,r}(0,0) \cap \mathcal{O}_{e_1}^+$, then

$$\frac{\partial u_{e_1}}{\partial n} - \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} = \frac{\partial w}{\partial n} < 0 \text{ on } \partial B_{R_1}(0) \cap \partial \mathcal{O}_{e_1}.$$

Now (2.12) together with the above inequality implies that $\lambda_1'(s) < 0$, which contradicts our assumption $\lambda_1'(s) = 0$. Thus we must have $w \equiv 0$ and hence $u \equiv u_{e_1}$ in $A_{R_1,r}(0,0) \cap \mathcal{O}_{e_1}^+$. Since $r \in (r_1, R_1)$ is arbitrary, we conclude that $u(x) = u(\sigma_{e_1}(x))$, $\forall x \in A_{R_1,r_1}(0,0)$. □

Next we show that u is symmetric in $A_{R_1,r_1}(0,0)$ with respect to all the hyperplanes.

Lemma 3.4. *Let s and r_1 be as in Lemma 3.3. Then for any nonzero vector $a \in \mathbb{R}^N$*

$$u_s(x) = u_s(\sigma_a(x)),\ \forall x \in A_{R_1,r_1}(0,0).$$

Proof. The case $\langle a, e_1\rangle = 0$ follows from Lemma 3.2. Note that $\sigma_a(x) = \sigma_{ka}(x)$ for $k \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. Thus, it is enough to prove the result for $a \in A_{R_1,r_1}(0,0)$ with $\langle a, e_1\rangle > 0$. In this case we have $\sigma_a(\mathcal{O}_a^+) \subset \mathcal{O}_a^-$. Now by setting $u = u_s$ and $u_a = u_s \circ \sigma_a$ we see that u_a and u satisfy the following problems in $\mathcal{O}_a^+$:

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta_p u_a = \lambda_1(s)\, u_a^{p-1}, \quad -\Delta_p u = \lambda_1(s)\, u^{p-1} \quad & \text{in } \mathcal{O}_a^+, \\ u_a = 0, \qquad u = 0 \qquad & \text{on } \partial B_{R_1}(0) \cap \partial \mathcal{O}_a^+, \\ u_a = u, \qquad u = u_a \qquad & \text{on } H_a \cap \partial \mathcal{O}_a^+, \\ u_a > 0, \qquad u = 0 \qquad & \text{on } \partial B_{R_0}(se_1) \cap \partial \mathcal{O}_a^+. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the weak comparison principle (Proposition 2.3), we obtain that $u_a \ge u$ in $\mathcal{O}_a^+$. As before we set $w = u_a - u$. From Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 3.3 we obtain $u(a) = u(-a)$ as below:

$$\begin{aligned} u(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_N) &= u(a_1, -a_2, \dots, a_N) \\ &= \cdots = u(a_1, -a_2, \dots, -a_N) = u(-a_1, -a_2, \dots, -a_N). \end{aligned}$$

By definition $u_a(a) = u(-a)$ and hence $w(a) = 0$. Now we proceed along the same lines as in Lemma 3.3 and see that w satisfies the following problem:

$$-\mathrm{div}(A(x)w) \ge 0 \text{ in } A_{R_1,r}(0,0) \cap \mathcal{O}_a^+; \quad w \ge 0 \text{ on } \partial(A_{R_1,r}(0,0) \cap \mathcal{O}_a^+)$$

for any $r \in (r_1, R_1)$, where the coefficient matrix $A(x)$ is uniformly positive definite. By the strong maximum principle we have either $w \equiv 0$ or else $w > 0$ in $A_{R_1,r}(0,0) \cap \mathcal{O}_a^+$. Since $w(a) = 0$, we obtain $w \equiv 0$ and hence $u \equiv u_a$ in $A_{R_1,r}(0,0) \cap \mathcal{O}_a^+$. Finally, using the reflection, we conclude that $u(x) = u(\sigma_a(x))$, $\forall\, x \in A_{R_1,r_1}(0,0)$. □

Theorem 3.5. *Let $s \in (0, R_1 - R_0)$ and let u_s be the first eigenfunction of $-\Delta_p$ on Ω_s. If $\lambda_1'(s) = 0$, then u_s is radial in the annulus $A_{R_1,r_1}(0,0)$, where r_1 is given by Lemma 3.3. Furthermore, $\nabla u_s = 0$ on $\partial B_{r_1}(0)$.*

Proof. Let $b, c \in A_{R_1,r_1}(0,0)$ be such that $b \neq c$ and $|b| = |c|$. Then there exists a constant k such that $a = k(b-c) \in A_{R_1,r_1}(0,0)$. Noting that $\sigma_a(b) = c$, from Lemma 3.4 we obtain that

$$u_s(b) = u_s(\sigma_a(b)) = u_s(c).$$

Since b and c are arbitrary, we conclude that u_s is radial in the annulus $A_{R_1,r_1}(0,0)$. Further, as u_s is continuously differentiable in $A_{R_1,r_1}(0,0)$ and $\nabla u_s(x_1) \cdot x_1 = 0$ (see (3.3)), the radiality of u_s gives $\nabla u_s = 0$ on $\partial B_{r_1}(0)$. □

Symmetries with respect to the affine hyperplanes passing through se_1

In this subsection we prove the radiality (up to a translation of the origin) of u_s in a neighbourhood of the inner boundary. Since $\widetilde{\sigma}_a(x) = \sigma_a(x)$ for a such that $\langle a, e_1\rangle = 0$, Lemma 3.2 holds as it is, and hence we have for $i = 2, \dots, N$

$$u_s(x) = u_s(\widetilde{\sigma}_{e_i}(x)) = u(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{i-1}, -x_i, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_N),\ \forall x \in \Omega_s.$$

Next we prove a symmetry result along the same lines as in Lemma 3.3.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $s \in (0, R_1 - R_0)$ and let u_s be the first eigenfunction of $-\Delta_p$ on Ω_s. If $\lambda_1'(s) = 0$, then there exists $r_0 > 0$ such that*

$$u_s(x) = u(\widetilde{\sigma}_{e_1}(x)) = u_s(-x_1 + 2s, x_2, \dots, x_N),\ \forall x \in A_{r_0,R_0}(se_1, se_1).$$

Proof. As it was shown in the proof of Lemma 3.3, we have $r^* \in (R_0 + s, R_1)$ such that $\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_1}(r^* e_1) = 0$. Define

$$r_0 = \inf\left\{|x - se_1| > 0 :\ \langle \nabla u(x), x - se_1\rangle = 0\right\}. \tag{3.7}$$

Clearly $r_0 \in (R_0, R_1 - s)$, since by Hopf's maximum principle $\langle \nabla u(x), x - se_1\rangle = |x - se_1| \frac{\partial u}{\partial n}(x) \neq 0$ on $\partial B_{R_0}(se_1)$. By the construction, $A_{r_0,R_0}(se_1, se_1)$ is the maximal annular neighbourhood of $\partial B_{R_0}(se_1)$ on which $\langle \nabla u(x), x - se_1\rangle$ is nonvanishing. Further, by the continuity of ∇u there must exist $x_0 \in \partial B_{r_0}(se_1)$ such that

$$\langle \nabla u(x_0), x_0 - se_1\rangle = 0.$$

As in the proof of Lemma 3.3, we linearise the p-Laplacian on the domain $A_{r,R_0}(se_1, se_1) \cap \widetilde{\mathcal{O}}_{e_1}^+$ with $R_0 < r < r_0$ by setting $w = \widetilde{u}_{e_1} - u$. Then w weakly satisfies the following problem:

$$\begin{aligned} -\mathrm{div}(A(x)\nabla w) = \lambda\left(\widetilde{u}_{e_1}^{p-1} - u^{p-1}\right) \geq 0 \quad & \text{in } A_{r,R_0}(se_1, se_1) \cap \widetilde{\mathcal{O}}_{e_1}^+, \\ w \geq 0 \quad & \text{on } \partial(A_{r,R_0}(se_1, se_1) \cap \widetilde{\mathcal{O}}_{e_1}^+). \end{aligned}$$

By similar arguments as in Lemma 3.3, the above differential operator is uniformly elliptic on $A_{r,R_0}(se_1, se_1) \cap \widetilde{\mathcal{O}}_{e_1}^+$ and hence by the strong maximum principle we have either $w \equiv 0$ or $w > 0$ on this domain. If $w > 0$ in $A_{r,R_0}(se_1, se_1) \cap \widetilde{\mathcal{O}}_{e_1}^+$, then by the Hopf maximum principle

$$\frac{\partial \widetilde{u}_{e_1}}{\partial n} - \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} = \frac{\partial w}{\partial n} < 0 \text{ on } \partial B_{R_0}(se_1) \cap \partial \widetilde{\mathcal{O}}_{e_1}^+.$$

Now (2.13) implies that $\lambda_1'(s) < 0$, a contradiction to the assumption $\lambda_1'(s) = 0$. Thus we must have $w \equiv 0$ and hence $u \equiv \widetilde{u}_{e_1}$ in $A_{r,R_0}(se_1, se_1) \cap \widetilde{\mathcal{O}}_{e_1}^+$. Since $r \in (R_0, r_0)$ is arbitrary, we obtain the desired fact. □

Next we state a lemma which is a counterpart of Lemma 3.4. The proof follows along the same lines.

Lemma 3.7. *Let $s \in (0, R_1 - R_0)$ and let u_s be the first eigenfunction of $-\Delta_p$ on Ω_s. If $\lambda_1'(s) = 0$, then for any nonzero vector $a \in \mathbb{R}^N$*

$$u_s(x) = u_s(\widetilde{\sigma}_a(x)),\ \forall x \in A_{r_0,R_1}(se_1, se_1),$$

where r_0 is given by Lemma 3.6.

The next theorem, which is a counterpart of Theorem 3.5, states that u_s is radial (up to a translation of the origin) in a neighbourhood of the inner ball. The proof follows along the same lines using Lemma 3.2, Lemma 3.6 and Lemma 3.7.

Theorem 3.8. *Let $s \in (0, R_1 - R_0)$ and let u_s be the first eigenfunction of $-\Delta_p$ on Ω_s. If $\lambda_1'(s) = 0$, then u_s is radial in the annulus $A_{r_0,R_0}(se_1, se_1)$. Furthermore, $\nabla u_s = 0$ on $\partial B_{r_0}(se_1)$.*

Remark 3.9. Let u_0 be a positive first eigenfunction of $-\Delta_p$ on $A_{R_1,R_0}(0,0)$. Note that u_0 is radial (cf. [21, Proposition 1.1]) and one can verify that u_0 attains its maximum on a unique sphere of radius $\bar{r} \in (R_0, R_1)$ and $u_0'(\bar{r}) = 0$. From the simiplicity of the first eigenvalue, it is clear that every first eigenfunction u of $-\Delta_p$ on $A_{R_1,R_0}(0,0)$ is radial and $u'(\bar{r}) = 0$.

Lemma 3.10. *Let $\lambda_1'(s) = 0$ for some $s \in (0, R_1 - R_0)$. Let r_0 and r_1 be given by Lemmas 3.2 and 3.6, respectively. Then $r_0 = r_1 = \bar{r}$.*

Proof. From the definitions of r_0 and r_1 (see (3.7) and (3.2)) it easily follows that $r_0 \le r_1$. First we show that $r_1 \le \bar{r}$. Suppose that $r_1 > \bar{r}$. For notational simplicity, we denote an annular region with centre at the origin as $A_{t_1,t_0} = A_{t_1,t_0}(0,0)$. Now consider the following function on A_{R_1,R_0}:

$$w_1(x) = \begin{cases} u_s(x), & x \in A_{R_1,r_1}, \\ C_1, & x \in A_{r_1,\bar{r}}, \\ u_0(x), & x \in A_{\bar{r},R_0}, \end{cases}$$

where $C_1 = u_s(x)$ for $|x| = r_1$. By multiplying with an appropriate constant we can choose u_0 in such a way that $u_0(x) = C_1$ for $|x| = \bar{r}$. Since w_1 is continuous and piecewise differentiable on A_{R_1,R_0} we have $w_1 \in W_0^{1,p}(A_{R_1,R_0})$. To estimate $\|\nabla w_1\|_p^p$, we derive a few identities. Note that for any $r \in (r_1, R_1)$, ∇u_s does not vanish on $A_{R_1,r}$ and hence $u_s \in \mathcal{C}^2(A_{R_1,r})$, see Proposition 2.1. Thus $u_s \in \mathcal{C}^2(A_{R_1,r_1})$ and hence the following equation holds pointwise in A_{R_1,r_1} :

$$-\Delta_p u_s = \lambda_1(s)|u_s|^{p-2}u_s.$$

Multiply the above equation by u_s and integrate over A_{R_1,r_1} to get

$$\int\limits_{A_{R_1,r_1}} -\Delta_p u_s\ u_s\,\mathrm{d}x = \lambda_1(s) \int\limits_{A_{R_1,r_1}} |u_s|^{p-2}u_s\,u_s\,\mathrm{d}x.$$

Now by noting that $\nabla u_s = 0$ on $\partial B_{r_1}(0)$ and $u_s = 0$ on $\partial B_{R_1}(0)$, the integration by parts gives

$$\int\limits_{A_{R_1,r_1}} |\nabla u_s|^p\,\mathrm{d}x = \lambda_1(s) \int\limits_{A_{R_1,r_1}} |u_s|^p\,\mathrm{d}x. \tag{3.8}$$

Similarly

$$\int\limits_{A_{\bar{r},R_0}} |\nabla u_0|^p \,\mathrm{d}x = \lambda_1(0) \int\limits_{A_{\bar{r},R_0}} |u_0|^p \,\mathrm{d}x. \tag{3.9}$$

Now we estimate $\|\nabla w_1\|_p^p$:

$$\int\limits_{A_{R_1,R_0}} |\nabla w_1|^p \,\mathrm{d}x = \int\limits_{A_{R_1,r_1}} |\nabla u_s|^p \,\mathrm{d}x + \int\limits_{A_{\bar{r},R_0}} |\nabla u_0|^p \,\mathrm{d}x.$$

By using (3.8) and (3.9) and inequality $\lambda_1(s) \leq \lambda_1(0)$ we obtain

$$\int\limits_{A_{R_1,R_0}} |\nabla w_1|^p \,\mathrm{d}x \leq \lambda_1(0) \left(\int\limits_{A_{R_1,r_1}} |u_s|^p \,\mathrm{d}x + \int\limits_{A_{\bar{r},R_0}} |u_0|^p \,\mathrm{d}x \right).$$

Next we estimate $\|w_1\|_p^p$:

$$\begin{aligned} \int\limits_{A_{R_1,R_0}} |w_1|^p \,\mathrm{d}x &= \int\limits_{A_{R_1,r_1}} |u_s|^p \,\mathrm{d}x + \int\limits_{A_{r_1,\bar{r}}} C_1^p \,\mathrm{d}x + \int\limits_{A_{\bar{r},R_0}} |u_0|^p \,\mathrm{d}x \\ &> \int\limits_{A_{R_1,r_1}} |u_s|^p \,\mathrm{d}x + \int\limits_{A_{\bar{r},R_0}} |u_0|^p \,\mathrm{d}x. \end{aligned}$$

Now combining the above estimates, we arrive at

$$\int\limits_{A_{R_1,R_0}} |\nabla w_1|^p \,\mathrm{d}x < \lambda_1(0) \int\limits_{A_{R_1,R_0}} |w_1|^p \,\mathrm{d}x,$$

a contradiction to the definition of $\lambda_1(0)$. Hence we must have $r_1 \leq \bar{r}$.
Next we show that $\bar{r} \leq r_0$. Suppose that $\bar{r} > r_0$. In this case, we define w_2 on A_{R_1,R_0} as below:

$$w_2(x) = \begin{cases} u_0(x), & x \in A_{R_1,\bar{r}}, \\ C_2, & x \in A_{\bar{r},r_0}, \\ u_s(x + se_1), & x \in A_{r_0,R_0}, \end{cases}$$

where $C_2 = u_s(x)$ for $|x + se_1| = r_0$ and u_0 is scaled to satisfy $u_0(x) = C_2$ for $|x| = \bar{r}$. As before we see that $w_2 \in W_0^{1,p}(A_{R_1,R_0})$ and

$$\int\limits_{A_{R_1,R_0}} |\nabla w_2|^p \,\mathrm{d}x < \lambda_1(0) \int\limits_{A_{R_1,R_0}} |w_2|^p \,\mathrm{d}x,$$

which again contradicts the definition of $\lambda_1(0)$. Thus $\bar{r} \leq r_0$ and we conclude that $r_0 = \bar{r} = r_1$. □

Now we give a proof of our main theorem.

Proof of Theorem 1.1:
Suppose that there exists $s > 0$ such that $\lambda_1'(s) = 0$. Now Lemmas 3.2, 3.6 and 3.10 give r_0 and

r_1 with $r_0 = r_1$. Further, from the definitions of r_0 and r_1 (see (3.7) and (3.2)) we can deduce that

$$\nabla u((r_0 + s)e_1) = 0 \text{ and } \nabla u(re_1) \neq 0, \forall r > r_1.$$

This is a contradiction, since $r_0 + s = r_1 + s > r_1$. Thus $\lambda_1'(s) < 0$ for all $s \in (0, R_1 - R_0)$. □

Remark 3.11. Note that in Theorem 1.1 we consider only the case $\overline{B_{R_0}(se_1)} \subset B_{R_1}(0)$, i.e., $s \in [0, R_1 - R_0)$. For any s_1, s_2 satisfying $\sqrt{R_1^2 - R_0^2} \leq s_1 < s_2 \leq R_1 + R_0$, it is geometrically evident that

$$B_{R_1}(0) \setminus \overline{B_{R_0}(s_1e_1)} \subsetneq B_{R_1}(0) \setminus \overline{B_{R_0}(s_2e_1)}.$$

Now the strict domain monotonicity of $\lambda_1(s)$ (cf. Lemma 5.7 of [10]) gives $\lambda_1(s_1) > \lambda_1(s_2)$. Thus $\lambda_1(s)$ is strictly decreasing on $[\sqrt{R_1^2 - R_0^2}, R_1 + R_0]$. Further, $\lambda_1(s) = \lambda_1(B_{R_1}(0))$ for $s > R_1 + R_0$.

Remark 3.12. It can be easily seen that the measure of the set $B_{R_1}(0) \setminus \overline{B_{R_0}(se_1)}$ strictly decreases with respect to $s \in [R_1 - R_0, \sqrt{R_1^2 - R_0^2}]$. However, nothing is known about the behaviour of $\lambda_1(B_{R_1}(0) \setminus \overline{B_{R_0}(se_1)})$ on this interval.

Remark 3.13. Let Ω_0, Ω_1 be any two balls $\mathbb{R}^N$ such that $\Omega_0 \subsetneq \Omega_1, |\Omega_0| = |B_0|$ and $|\Omega_1| = |B_1|$, where B_0 and B_1 are concentric balls. Then Theorem 1.1 gives us that $\lambda_1(\Omega_1 \setminus \overline{\Omega_0}) \leq \lambda_1(B_1 \setminus \overline{B_0})$. This inequality does not hold in general, if Ω_0 and Ω_1 are not balls. For example, consider the rectangular domains Ω_0 (sides $\frac{\pi R_0}{n}$ and $R_0 n$) and Ω_1 (sides $\frac{\pi R_1}{n}$ and $R_1 n$). Clearly $\lambda_1(\Omega_1 \setminus \Omega_0) \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$ and $\lambda_1(B_1 \setminus \overline{B_0}) = \lambda_1(A_{R_1,R_0}(0,0)) < \infty$.

4 Limit cases $p = 1$ and $p = \infty$

In this section we prove Theorem 1.2. Recall that

$$\Lambda_\infty(s) := \lim_{p\to\infty} \lambda_1^{1/p}(p, s) \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda_1(s) := \lim_{p\to 1} \lambda_1(p, s).$$

By Theorem 1.1, for any $p > 1$ and $0 \leq s_1 < s_2 < R_1 - R_0$ it holds that $0 < \lambda_1(p, s_2) < \lambda_1(p, s_1)$ and hence we immediately deduce that

$$0 \leq \Lambda_1(s_2) \leq \Lambda_1(s_1), \quad 0 \leq \Lambda_\infty(s_2) \leq \Lambda_\infty(s_1). \tag{4.1}$$

To show that $\Lambda_\infty(s)$ is continuous and strictly decreasing on $[0, R_1 - R_0)$, we use the following geometric characterization of $\Lambda_\infty(s)$ obtained in [17]:

$$\Lambda_\infty(s) = \frac{1}{r_{\max}},$$

where $r_{\max}$ is the radius of a maximal ball inscribed in Ω_s.

Proof of part (i) of Theorem 1.2. For $s \in [0, R_1 - R_0)$, a simple calculation shows that $r_{\max} = \frac{R_1 - R_0 + s}{2}$ and hence

$$\Lambda_\infty(s) = \frac{2}{R_1 - R_0 + s}.$$

Thus one can easily see that $\Lambda_\infty(s)$ is continuous and strictly decreasing on $s \in [0, R_1 - R_0)$. □

Remark 4.1. The geometric characterization of $\Lambda_\infty(s)$ allows us to compute $\Lambda_\infty(s)$ even for $s \geq R_1 - R_0$. Indeed, the same calculation gives us,

$$\Lambda_\infty(s) = \begin{cases} \frac{2}{R_1 - R_0 + s} & \text{for} \quad s \in [0, R_1 + R_0), \\ \frac{1}{R_1} & \text{for} \quad s \geq R_1 + R_0. \end{cases}$$

Clearly $\Lambda_\infty(s)$ is continuous everywhere and differentiable except at the points $s = 0$ and $s = R_1 + R_0$.

We refer the reader to [20] for related problems on the domain dependence of Λ_∞.

Now we consider the case $p = 1$. From (4.1) we know that $\Lambda_1(s)$ is decreasing. To show the continuity of $\Lambda_1(s)$ and to prove part (ii) of Theorem 1.2, we use the following variational characterization of $\Lambda_1(s)$ given in [18]:

$$\Lambda_1(s) = h(s),$$

where $h(s)$ stands for the Cheeger constant of Ω_s which can be defined as

$$h(s) := \inf \frac{|\partial D|}{|D|}. \tag{4.2}$$

Here the infimum is taken over all Lipschitz subdomains D of $\overline{\Omega}_s$ and $|\cdot|$ denote the Hausdorff measures (coincide with the usual volume and surface area for Lipschitz domains) of dimension $N-1$ in the numerator and the dimension N in the denominator. Any minimizer of (4.2) is called a Cheeger set. It is known that a Cheeger set always exists, see Theorem 8 of [18].

As in Section 2, by considering perturbations of Ω_s given by the vector field in (2.7) we apply Theorem 1.1 of [22] to conclude that $h(s)$ is continuous on $[0, R_1 - R_0)$.

Proof of part (ii) of Theorem 1.2. It is known (see, for instance, [7] and also references therein) that concentric annulus Ω_0 is calibrable, (i.e., Ω_0 itself is a Cheeger set of Ω_0) and hence

$$h(0) = \frac{|\partial \Omega_0|}{|\Omega_0|} = N \, \frac{R_1^{N-1} + R_0^{N-1}}{R_1^N - R_0^N}.$$

On the other hand, for the eccentric annulus Ω_s with $s \in (0, R_1 - R_0)$ it is clear that

$$h(s) \leq \frac{|\partial \Omega_s|}{|\Omega_s|} = N \, \frac{R_1^{N-1} + R_0^{N-1}}{R_1^N - R_0^N} = h(0).$$

Next we show that for s sufficiently close to $R_1 - R_0$ the above inequality is strict. For this we construct an appropriate subset D of Ω_s satisfying $\frac{|\partial D|}{|D|} < h(0)$.

In this proof, without any ambiguity, we use $|\cdot|$ to denote the various measures such as the length, surface area and volume of the objects lie in the appropriate spaces. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be sufficiently small and let $B' = |OB'|\, e_1$ be the point such that $|OB'| = \sqrt{R_1^2 - \varepsilon^2}$ (see Fig. 1). Then the hyperplane perpendicular to e_1 at B' intersects with $B_{R_1}(0)$ by the $(N-1)$-dimensional ball B_1 of radius $|BB'| = \varepsilon$. By choosing $s = s_\varepsilon = \sqrt{R_1^2 - \varepsilon^2} - R_0$, we see that the ball $B_{R_0}(se_1)$ touches B_1. Now consider the N-dimensional "convex-concave lens" $ABCD_{\text{lens}}$ bounded by the spherical caps BC_{cap} and AD_{cap} of the spheres $\partial B_{R_1}(0)$ and $\partial B_{R_0}(se_1)$, respectively, and by the lateral cylindrical surface AB_{lat} generated by the segment AB parallel to e_1. Let $ABCD_{\text{cyl}}$



Figure 1: "Convex-concave lens" $ABCD_{\text{lens}}$ (grey) and cylinder $ABCD_{\text{cyl}}$ (dashed).

be the cylinder of radius $|BB'|$ and height $|AB|$. For simplicity, we denote the various positive constants which are independent of ε by k. For $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} |AB| = |A'B'| &= R_0 - \sqrt{R_0^2 - \varepsilon^2} \approx k\varepsilon^2; \\ |AD_{\text{cap}}| > |BC_{\text{cap}}| &> |B_1| = k\varepsilon^{N-1}; \\ |ABCD_{\text{lens}}| < |ABCD_{\text{cyl}}| &= |AB||B_1| \approx k\varepsilon^2\,\varepsilon^{N-1}; \\ |AB_{\text{lat}}| &= |AB||\partial B_1| \approx k\varepsilon^2\,\varepsilon^{N-2}. \end{aligned}$$

Now by making use of the above estimates we obtain

$$\frac{|\partial\left(\Omega_s \setminus ABCD_{\text{lens}}\right)|}{|\Omega_s \setminus ABCD_{\text{lens}}|} = \frac{|\partial\Omega_s| - |AD_{\text{cap}}| - |BC_{\text{cap}}| + |AB_{\text{lat}}|}{|\Omega_s| - |ABCD_{\text{lens}}|} < \frac{|\partial\Omega_s| - 2k\varepsilon^{N-1} + k\varepsilon^N}{|\Omega_s| - k\varepsilon^{N+1}} < \frac{|\partial\Omega_s|}{|\Omega_s|}$$

for sufficiently small ε. Therefore, there exists $s > 0$ such that $h(s) < h(0)$. Now define

$$s^* := \inf\{s \in [0, R_1 - R_0) : \ h(0) > h(s)\}. \tag{4.3}$$

Since $h(s)$ is continuous, by the definition of s^*, we easily see that $h(0) = h(s^*)$ and $h(s^*) > h(s)$ for any $s \in (s^*, R_1 - R_0)$. □

Remark 4.2. Clearly $h(s) = h(0)$ for every $s \in [0, s^*]$. Thus, if $s^* > 0$, then the strict monotonicity of $\lambda_1(s)$ fails for $p = 1$. However, whether $s^* > 0$ or not is still open. Further, the strict monotonicity of $h(s)$ on the interval $[s^*, R_1 - R_0]$ is not answered yet. It is worth to mention that a shape derivative formula for $h_1(\Omega)$ is obtained in [22] for Ω having just one Cheeger set. However, the uniqueness of the Cheeger set for eccentric annular regions Ω_s is not known.

5 Application to the Fučik spectrum

In this section we prove Theorem 1.3. For this end, we use Theorem 1.1 and the variational characterization (1.7) of $\mathscr{C}$, the first nontrivial curve of the Fučik spectrum for the eigenvalue problem (1.6), see [10]. Recall that $\mathscr{C}$ is constructed from points $(t + c(t), c(t))$, where

$$c(t) = \inf_{\gamma\in\Gamma} \max_{u\in\gamma[-1,1]} \left(\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^p \, \mathrm{d}x - t \int_\Omega (u^+)^p \, \mathrm{d}x \right), \quad t \geq 0,$$

and their reflections with respect to the diagonal. See (1.8) for the definition of Γ.

Proof of Theorem 1.3: Let Ω be a bounded radial domain. Suppose there exist a point on $\mathscr{C}$ and a corresponding eigenfunction u which is radial. Without loss of generality, we can suppose that $t \geq 0$ (otherwise we consider $-u$ instead of u). Thus u satisfies the following equation:

$$\left.\begin{aligned} -\Delta_p u = (t + c(t))(u^+)^{p-1} - c(t)(u^-)^{p-1} \quad &\text{in} \quad \Omega, \\ u = 0 \quad &\text{on} \quad \partial\Omega. \end{aligned}\right\}$$

By Theorem 2.1 of [11], we know that u has exactly two nodal domains, $N^+ := \{x \in \Omega : u(x) > 0\}$ and $N^- := \{x \in \Omega : u(x) < 0\}$. Since the restriction of u to each of the nodal domains is an eigenfunction of $-\Delta_p$ with a constant sign, we easily get

$$\lambda_1(N^+) = t + c(t) \text{ and } \lambda_1(N^-) = c(t). \tag{5.1}$$

Since u is radial and Ω is radially symmetric, the nodal domains are also radially symmetric. Assume for definiteness that u is negative near the outer boundary of Ω. Thus there exists $R > 0$ such that $N^+ = \{x \in \Omega : |x| < R\}$ and $N^- = \{x \in \Omega : |x| > R\}$. If Ω is a ball, say $B_{R_1}(0)$, then $N^+ = B_R(0)$ and $N^- = A_{R_1,R}(0,0)$. Now for $s \in (0, R_1 - R)$, by using (5.1) and Theorem 1.1 we obtain $\lambda_1(B_R(se_1)) = t + c(t)$ and $\lambda_1(A_{R_1,R}(0, se_1)) < c(t)$. Further, using the continuity of $\lambda_1(\Omega)$ (see, for instance, Theorem 1 of [13]) we can find $\widetilde{R} \in (R, R_1)$ such that

$$\lambda_1(B_{\widetilde{R}}(se_1)) < t + c(t) \text{ and } \lambda_1(A_{R_1,\widetilde{R}}(0, se_1)) < c(t).$$

If Ω is an annulus, say $A_{R_1,R_0}(0,0)$, then we have $N^+ = A_{R,R_0}(0,0)$ and $N^- = A_{R_1,R}(0,0)$. Now for $0 < s < \min\{R_1 - R, R - R_0\}$ by using (5.1) and Theorem 1.1 we obtain

$$\lambda_1(A_{R,R_0}(se_1, 0)) < t + c(t) \text{ and } \lambda_1(A_{R_1,R}(0, se_1)) < c(t).$$

In either case, we have two disjoint domains Ω_1 and Ω_2 such that

$$\lambda_1(\Omega_1) < t + c(t) \text{ and } \lambda_1(\Omega_2) < c(t).$$

Let u_1 and u_2 be corresponding eigenfunctions. Clearly u_1 and u_2 have disjoint supports and

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla u_1|^p \, \mathrm{d}x < (t + c(t)) \int_\Omega |u_1|^p \, \mathrm{d}x \text{ and } \int_\Omega |\nabla u_2|^p \, \mathrm{d}x < c(t) \int_\Omega |u_2|^p \, \mathrm{d}x.$$

The above inequalities lead to a contradiction to the definition (1.7) of $c(t)$ by the same arguments as in the proof of Theorem 3.1 of [10]. Thus u must be nonradial. This completes the proof. □

References

[1] T. V. Anoop, P. Drábek, and S. Sasi. On the structure of the second eigenfunctions of the p-Laplacian on a ball. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 144(6):2503–2512, 2016. 4

[2] M. S. Ashbaugh and R. D. Benguria. Isoperimetric inequalities for eigenvalues of the Laplacian. In *Proceedings of Symposia in Pure Mathematics*, volume 76, pages 105–139. Providence, RI; American Mathematical Society; 1998, 2007. 2

[3] G. Barles. Remarks on uniqueness results of the first eigenvalue of the p-Laplacian. *Toulouse. Faculté des Sciences. Annales. Mathématiques. Série 5*, 9(1):65–75, 1988. 7

[4] T. Bartsch and M. Degiovanni. Nodal solutions of nonlinear elliptic Dirichlet problems on radial domains. *Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei. Classe di Scienze Fisiche, Matematiche e Naturali. Rendiconti Lincei. Serie IX. Matematica e Applicazioni*, 17(1):69–85, 2006. 4

[5] T. Bartsch, T. Weth, and M. Willem. Partial symmetry of least energy nodal solutions to some variational problems. *Journal d'Analyse Mathématique*, 96:1–18, 2005. 4

[6] J. Benedikt, P. Drábek, and P. Girg. The first nontrivial curve in the Fučik spectrum of the Dirichlet Laplacian on the ball consists of nonradial eigenvalues. *Boundary Value Problems*, 2011(1):1–9, 2011. 4

[7] H. Bueno and G. Ercole. On the p-torsion functions of an annulus. *Asymptotic Analysis*, 92(3-4):235–247, 2015. 15

[8] A. M. H. Chorwadwala and R. Mahadevan. An eigenvalue optimization problem for the p-Laplacian. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh: Section A Mathematics*, 145(6):1145–1151, 2015. 2, 3, 5, 7

[9] A. M. H. Chorwadwala, R. Mahadevan, and F. Toledo. On the Faber–Krahn inequality for the Dirichlet p-Laplacian. *ESAIM: Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations*, 21(1):60–72, 2015. 2, 7

[10] M. Cuesta, D. de Figueiredo, and J.-P. Gossez. The beginning of the Fučik spectrum for the p-Laplacian. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 159(1):212–238, 1999. 3, 14, 16, 17

[11] M. Cuesta, D. G. De Figueiredo, and J.-P. Gossez. A nodal domain property for the p-Laplacian. *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences. Série I. Mathématique*, 330(8):669–673, 2000. 4, 17

[12] P. R. Garabedian and M. Schiffer. Convexity of domain functionals. *Journal d'Analyse Mathématique*, 2(2):281–368, 1952. 2

[13] J. García Melián and J. Sabina de Lis. On the perturbation of eigenvalues for the p-Laplacian. *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences. Série I. Mathématique*, 332(10):893–898, 2001. 2, 4, 5, 17

[14] E. M. Harrel II, P. Kröger, and K. Kurata. On the placement of an obstacle or a well so as to optimize the fundamental eigenvalue. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 33(1):240–259, 2001. 2

[15] A. Henrot. *Extremum problems for eigenvalues of elliptic operators*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006. 2

[16] J. Hersch. The method of interior parallels applied to polygonal or multiply connected membranes. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, 13(4):1229–1238, 1963. 2

[17] P. Juutinen, P. Lindqvist, and J. J. Manfredi. The ∞-eigenvalue problem. *Archive for rational mechanics and analysis*, 148(2):89–105, 1999. 3, 14

[18] B. Kawohl and V. Fridman. Isoperimetric estimates for the first eigenvalue of the p-Laplace operator and the Cheeger constant. *Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae*, 44(4):659–667, 2003. 3, 15

[19] S. Kesavan. On two functionals connected to the Laplacian in a class of doubly connected domains. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh. Section A. Mathematics*, 133(3):617–624, 2003. 2

[20] J. C. Navarro, J. D. Rossi, A. San Antolin, and N. Saintier. The dependence of the first eigenvalue of the infinity Laplacian with respect to the domain. *Glasgow Mathematical Journal*, 56(02):241–249, 2014. 15

[21] A. Nazarov. The one-dimensional character of an extremum point of the Friedrichs inequality in spherical and plane layers. *Journal of Mathematical Sciences*, 102(5):4473–4486, 2000. 12

[22] E. Parini and N. Saintier. Shape derivative of the Cheeger constant. *ESAIM: Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations*, 21(2):348–358, 2015. 15, 16

[23] A. G. Ramm and P. N. Shivakumar. Inequalities for the minimal eigenvalue of the Laplacian in an annulus. *Mathematical Inequalities & Applications*, (4):559–563, 1998. Updated version: arXiv:math-ph/9911040. 2

[24] J. Sokolowski and J.-P. Zolésio. *Introduction to shape optimization, Shape sensitivity analysis*, volume 16 of *Springer Series in Computational Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1992. 2

[25] J. L. Vázquez. A strong maximum principle for some quasilinear elliptic equations. *Applied Mathematics and Optimization*, 12(1):191–202, 1984. 7

T. V. Anoop: Department of Mathematics, Indian Institute of Technology Madras, Chennai 36, India.
Email: anoop@iitm.ac.in

Vladimir Bobkov: Department of Mathematics and NTIS, Faculty of Applied Sciences, University of West Bohemia, Univerzitní 8, Plzeň 306 14, Czech Republic.
Institute of Mathematics, Ufa Scientific Center, Russian Academy of Sciences, Chernyshevsky str. 112, Ufa 450008, Russia.
Email: bobkov@kma.zcu.cz

Sarath Sasi: School of Mathematical Sciences, National Institute for Science Education and Research Bhubaneswar, Jatni 752050, India.
Email: sarath@niser.ac.in